

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 are pending in the present Application. Claims 1 and 6 are amended by the present amendment. Support for amendments to the claims can be found in the claims as originally filed. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Action, Claims 1-3, 7 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Izawa et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,264,556, herein "Izawa") in view of Blad et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2003/0063035, herein "Blad"); Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Izawa and Blad in view of Bryant et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,513,639, herein "Bryant"); Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Izawa and Blad in view of Lamah (U.S. Pat. No. 5,788,046); Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Izawa and Blad in view of Cassidy et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,615,625, herein "Cassidy"); Claims 8-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Izawa and Blad in view of Handelman et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/0048067, herein "Handelman"); and Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Izawa and Blad in view of Battrick (U.S. Pat. No. 3,806,651).

Addressing now the rejection of Claim 1-3, 7 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Izawa and Blad, that rejection is respectfully traversed. In addition, Applicants note that some of the features of Claim 6 have been incorporated into Claim 1.

Amended Claim 1 recites, in part,

a money validation unit for validating money provided from outside;

a detachable money storage unit for storing the money that has been determined as valid by said money validation unit, the money storage unit including a lid to be opened when the money stored within said money storage unit is collected and a lid lock/unlock unit;

a first power-signal connection configured to transmit, as a pulse signal, both electric power and a money information signal representing information on the money to be stored in said money storage unit; and

a second power-signal connection configured as a ground,

wherein said money validation unit supplies both said electric power and said money information signal to the detachable money storage unit via the first power-signal connection when said money validation unit is electrically connected to said money storage unit and the lid lock/unlock unit locks or unlocks the lid using the electric power.

Izawa describes a gaming machine which includes a bill validator 12 and a note hopper 110. However, Izawa does not describe or suggest two connection terminals, the first connection transmitting, as a pulse signal, both electric power and a money information signal and the second connection configured as a ground.

The outstanding Action relies on Blad as curing the deficiencies of Izawa with regard to the claimed invention.

Blad describes a currency container tracking system, the currency container 100 including a memory module 102. In addition, Blad describes that the memory module 102 connects to a data unit 112 via two contacts 110/104. Further, Blad describes that the memory module 102 is able to scavenge power from the data line to which the device is attached.

However, as is acknowledged on page 6 of the outstanding Action, neither Izawa nor Blad describes or suggests a lid lock/unlock unit that locks or unlocks the lid using the electric power received via the first power-signal connection as is recited in Claim 1.

Nevertheless, the outstanding Action cites Cassidy as curing the deficiencies of Izawa and Blad with regard to this feature of the claimed invention.

Cassidy describes a system for the secure transportation of articles such as cheques and bank notes using a container with a lid/door 50/44. In addition, Cassidy describes that the door is opened/closed by solenoids 100 which are controlled by the electronic circuitry of the docking station 96 and the lid is operated by a motorized mechanism. In addition, Cassidy

describes that the motorized locking mechanism and the solenoids are operated by a lead acid battery in the container.¹

However, Cassidy does not describe or suggest a lid lock/unlock unit that locks or unlocks the lid using the electric power received via the first power-signal connection.

Thus, the outstanding Action appears to be relying on the combination of the data line of Blad and the electric lid of Cassidy as describing the features of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this combination. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that the power required to operate the electric lid of Cassidy could not possibly be “scavenged” from the data line of Blad. MPEP §2143.01 states “If proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984).”

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention. MPEP 2142 states “rejections on obviousness cannot be sustained with mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.” *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988, 78 USPQ2d 1329, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2006). See also *KSR*, 550 U.S. at ___, 82 USPQ2d at 1396 (quoting Federal Circuit statement with approval). The outstanding Action states on page 6 that “it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Izawa/Blad’s money validation machine to include an electronic lock, as taught by Cassidy for the purpose of added security.” However, Applicants respectfully submit that it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the ***first power-signal connection*** for both powering the electronic lock and for providing a money information signal.

¹ Cassidy, col. 4, lines 59-63.

In addition, none of the further cited Bryant, Lamah, Handelman or Battrick references cure the above noted deficiencies of Izawa, Blad and Cassidy.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 and claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Izawa, Blad, Cassidy, Bryant, Lamah, Handelman and Battrick considered individually or in any proper combination.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussion, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.


Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

James Love
Registration No. 58,421